REMARKS

This Amendment, filed in reply to the Office Action dated November 2, 2007, is believed

to be fully responsive to each point of the rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable

reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-15 are all the claims pending in the application. Claim 16 is canceled.

Allowable subject matter

Applicant acknowledges with thanks the Examiner's indication of claim 15 as allowable

subject matter. In view of the arguments below, Applicant respectfully submits that all the

claims in the subject application are patentable over the cited prior art. Applicant earnestly

solicits the allowance of all the claims in this application.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner did not consider the "CORE JINI" reference cited in the form 1449

submitter on January 17, 2006. A copy of the reference is submitted herewith. Applicant

respectfully requests the consideration of the reference at this time.

Objection to the specification

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the objections to the specification

in view of the self-explanatory amendments presented in the attached substitute specification.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 1-16 are objected for informalities. The claims have been amended to overcome

the objection.

Further regarding claims 12-16, the Examiner objected to these claims indication that the

claims are not further limiting. Applicant respectfully traverses this objection. Claim 12 further

define that the service equipment comprises sender means. Whereas claim 13 further defines that

said sender means are adapted to place ...address data...Claims 14 and 15, further define the format of the address. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are further limiting and therefore are in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c). Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of these objections.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The claims are to be interpreted in light of the specification.

"Portions of the network that have service selection means" refers to those network elements that are configured to query a service selection means. A service selection means refers to an apparatus connected to the network, e.g. a server, which receives queries for a given service and provides responses comprising an address of equipment offering the requested service ([0006]). As examples of service selection means, the specification refers, *inter alia*, to Domain Name Servers (Specification, para. [0039]) and printer directories (Specification, para. [0006]) .

"Portions of the network that have no service selection means" refers to those network elements that are not configured to query the said service selection means, e.g. Domain Name Server or printer directory (Specification, para. [0006]).

In view of the description, Applicant submits that one skilled in the art would be able to ascertain the mete and bounds on the claim. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 16 is now cancelled, therefore this rejection is moot. Applicant respectfully

requests the withdrawal of this rejection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 9, 11-12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Leonard Primak (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0095488; hereinafter "Primak") in view of Jindal et

al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,092,178; hereinafter "Jindal"). Applicant respectfully traverses this

rejection.

Independent claim 1 recites:

> A method of managing services offered by communication equipment of
> an Internet Protocol communication network, wherein the method comprising:
> reporting to communication equipment that are situated in portions of said
> network that have service selection means and in portions of said network that
> have no service selection means services offered by the communication
> equipment that belong to said network portions that do not have service selection
> means.

On the other hand, Primak relates to discovering, advertising and locating services over a

network. See paragraph [0002]. The Examiner correctly concedes that "Primak does not

explicitly disclose that the communications equipment is situated in portions of said network that

have service selection means that the services are offered by the communications equipment that

belongs to said network portions that do not have service selection means." The Examiner

maintains that "Jindal discloses a network topology with communications equipment (clients 120

and DNS server 100 of Fig. 1) situated in a portion of a network that has service selection means

[Jindal: serving as service selection means] and communication equipment (110,112, 114 of Fig.

1) situated in a portion of said network that has no server selection means [Jindal: serving as no

selection service means] wherein services are offered by communication equipment that belongs

to said network portion that does not have service selection means [Jindal: servers (110, 112,

114) not including DNS server (100), Figure 1]. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's

position.

Jindal relates to a method for executing a set of computer readable instructions in

response to a network resource request. However, similar to Primak, Jindal does not teach or

suggest reporting to the communication equipment that are situated not only in portions of said

network that have service selection means but also in those that have none. Therefore, Jindal

does not remedy the deficient teachings of Primak. For at least this reason, Applicant submits

that the combination would not have resulted in the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant

respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 9 recites similar limitation as claim 1 and thus is patentable for analogous reasons

as set forth above. Claims 11-12 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency upon claim

9.

Claims 2 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over

Primak and Jindal in further view of Sakurai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,955,599; herein after

Sakurai). Claims 2 and 13 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1 and 9.

Claims 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Primak,

Jindal and Sakurai in further view of Sumandra Majee et al. (IPv6 extension to RPC, hereinafter

"Majee").

Claims 3-7 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1. In addition,

Majee does not remedy the deficient teachings of Primak and Jindal.

Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Primak

and Jindal in further view of Majee.

Claims 8 and 10 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Primak, Jindal

and Sakurai in further view of Hinden et al. (IP Version 6 addressing architecture).

Claims 14 is patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 9.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

<div align="right">Respectfully submitted,</div>

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC　　　　　　　/Logan J. Brown 58,290/
Telephone: (202) 293-7060　　　　　　Logan J. Brown
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860　　　　　　Registration No. 58,290

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 28, 2008